



January 24, 2002

Mr. Jesus Toscano, Jr.
Administrative Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2002-0347

Dear Mr. Toscano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 157693.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received two written requests from different individuals for the videotapes of the presentations made by vendors in connection with RFP# BUZ0109. You contend that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 252.049 of the Local Government Code. Additionally, you have requested a decision from this office pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, which allows governmental bodies to rely on third parties having a privacy or property interest in the information to submit their own arguments as to why the requested information is excepted from public disclosure.

We first consider your section 552.101 claim. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 252.049 of the Local Government Code provides:

- (a) Trade secrets and confidential information in competitive sealed bids are not open for public inspection.
- (b) If provided in a request for proposals, proposals shall be opened in a manner that avoids disclosure of the contents to competing offerors and keeps the proposals secret during negotiations. All proposals are open for public inspection after the contract is awarded, but trade secrets and confidential information in the proposals are not open for public inspection.

Local Gov't Code § 252.049(a), (b). This provision is duplicative of the protection offered to proprietary information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We will therefore address the extent to which the requested information is confidential under section 552.110.

In accordance with section 552.305(d), the city was required to notify the four proposers of the records request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their respective presentations should not be released to the public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). This office did not receive responses from the four proposers. Consequently, this office must consider whether the city has demonstrated the applicability of section 552.110 to the submitted information.

Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for

exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." An entity will not meet its burden under section 552.110(b) by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. Cf. *National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The governmental body or interested third party raising section 552.110(b) must provide a specific factual or evidentiary showing that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure of the requested information. See Open Records Decision No. 639 at 4 (1996) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure).

After reviewing the city's brief to this office, we conclude that the city has not demonstrated the applicability of either aspect of section 552.110 to the submitted information. Accordingly, we conclude that the city must release the requested information in its entirety to the requestors.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

¹The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are: "(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS, § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/RWP/sdk

Ref: ID# 157693

Enc: Submitted videotape

c: Mr. Norman Daniel Grunsfeld
CorData
6500 Greenville Avenue, Suite 510
Dallas, Texas 75206
(w/o enclosure)

Mr. Calvin Dorsey
Dorsey & Company
2049 Vista Drive
Lewisville, Texas 75067
(w/o enclosure)

Ms. Darlene Dailey
Citistreet
190 E. John Carpenter Freeway
Irving, Texas 75062
(w/o enclosure)

Mr. Dale Sharpe-Jenkins
Jenkins Insurance Agency
1600 E. Lamar, Suite 290
Arlington, Texas 76011
(w/o enclosure)